# Part One: The Story:

**To be black is to be wrong,  
confined to a constant state of war with civil society,   
a war with no end in sight and no potential for peaceful resolution.  
Black voices are seen as enemy voices as wrong and as such civil society strips us of our right to speak,**

#### Educational institutions, such as debate, exclude Black speech to sustain Whiteness. The role of the judge is to revolt against that form of anti-blackness by interjecting Black speech into the conversation. Put your theory shells away the K controls the internal link to any education or fairness impacts; it is a prerequisite to debate. If my opponent initiates theory grant aff RVI’s to mitigate some of the inherent anti-blackness of theory. Schnyder 8

Damien Michael Schnyder (PhD, University of California’s President’s Postdoctoral Fellow) "First Strike," [https://www.lib.utexas.edu/etd/d/2009/schnyderd25688/schnyderd25688.pdf](https://www.lib.utexas.edu/etd/d/2009/schnyderd25688/schnyderd25688.pdf-https:/www.lib.utexas.edu/etd/d/2009/schnyderd25688/schnyderd25688.pdf)   
Ms. Fox’s clear disregard for her students belies a racist logic that dehumanizes Blackness while also reifying white supremacy. At the crux of this logic is that Black students are destructive to civil society. As argued by Frank Wilderson, III, “There is something organic to Black positionality that makes it essential to the destruction of civil society. There is nothing willful or speculative in this statement, for one could just as well state the claim the other way around: There is something organic to civil society that makes it essential to the destruction of the Black body” (Wilderson III, 2003, 18). Given that the basis of Western society has been predicated upon particular notions of work/labor, the construction of civil society is predicated upon forced labor. The function of society as dictated by capitalist interest is the production of workers. For even as a worker, the threat to the system is merely reformist. For as Wilderson comments, “The worker demands that productivity be fair and democratic” (Wilderson III, 2003, 22). Contrast to the position of the worker, Wilderson argues, “The slave demands that production stop, without recourse to its ultimate democratization. Work is not an organic principle forthe slave” (Wilderson III, 2003, 22). Black bodies, through their collective experiences of subjugated Blackness, become a threat to the very function of civil society. Blackness has to be contained and managed in order to protect white supremacy. Crucial to Wilderson’s argument is that white supremacy needs the reproduction of social relations of power (i.e. the identification of the worker) in order to maintain its subjective advantage with respect to Blackness.45 It is at this moment - when Blackness becomes identified as antithetical to the notions of work –that white supremacy is able to unleash it’s fury upon the Black body. For it is within this space that the Black body can have anything and everything done to protect the order of civil society.46 Thus in order to contain the threat of Blackness, the Herculean managers of the hydra-like attack upon society are teachers (Linebaugh & Rediker, 2000).47 Within the development of civil society, the function of teachers is to both categorize states of being and enclose Blackness. The categorization is clear by the actions of Ms. Fox while processes of enclosure are exemplified in Mr. Keynes’ classroom. Students are prevented from interjecting alternative versions of economic systems within the framework of the discussion. Students must perform the perfunctory duty of work (basic memorization and recitation skills) not to only to be awarded with a passing grade, but not to be penalized. The result is a silencing of Black voices whose life experiences are in direct contradiction with hegemonic constructions of economy (i.e. supply and demand) that was taught by Mr. Keynes. There was no space to analyze the racial structure that frames economic modes of relation, nor was there opportunity to engage in dialogue with regards to the economics of why many of the students had to work to support their families. Mr. Keynes’ classroom management and pedagogical style exemplifies the need of white supremacy to control, define and enclose racialized subjects. The primary objective of Mr. Keynes in addition to Mr. Davis and Ms. Fox was to socialize the students as productive workers in order to fit within the hierarchal confines of civil society. The main thrust behind this socialization effort was to define the students as subjects and remove the possibility for self-identification that was not located within a white supremacist conception of being – for a self-assertion outside of these parameters is the greatest threat to white supremacist modes of social (re)production.48The veil of nobility and morality that cloaks the teaching profession has to be understood as a tool utilized by the state to maintain its power. Inside of the walls of SCHS**, teachers operated within a genealogy of Black subjugation that seeks to enclose all sites of Black self -expression and** thought/action and as stated by Wilderson ultimately **“destroy the Black body.”** In it’s current manifestation, the process of Black subjugation functions within the logic of the prison regime as outlined by Dylan Rodríguez. Within this logic, teachers serve as agents of dissemination, discipline and socialization in order to preserve the economic, political, racial, sexual and gendered hierarchies established by the United States nation project. Further, during times of economic “crises” Ruth Wilson Gilmore notes that the veil of white privilege is removed as the logic of white supremacy that frames American nationalism is fully revealed (Gilmore, 1993).49 In order to untangle the multifaceted issues within public education, it is incumbent to analyze the root causes of inequality and inequity. In agreement with scholars such as Erica R. Meiners who advocate that white supremacy is the root cause, even teachers with the best of intentions have to realize that their role is vital to the maintenance of state domination of Black subjects.

**As Schnyder says the institutions that perpetuate this oppression are the very institutions we seek to escape oppression in the first place, such as public Universities and Colleges**

**The Ballot is a performative act – the ballot is exercising binding power. Every ballot matters – repetition is what confers power on the performative act. What we as debaters, spectator, and judges do today matters.** 5**Butler 93** Butler, noted for her studies on gender & teaches composition and rhetoric at Berkeley, 93 (Dr. Judith, ‘Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of Sex’) pp. 225

**Performative acts are forms of authoritative speech: most performatives**, for instance, are statements **that,** in the uttering, also perform a certain action and **exercise a binding power**.4 Implicated in a network of authorization and punishment, performatives tend to include legal sentences, baptisms, inaugurations, declarations of ownership, statements which not only perform an action, but confer a binding power on the action performed. **If the power of discourse to produce that which it names is linked with the question of performativity, then the performative is one domain in which power acts as discourse.** Importantly, however, **there is no power, construed as a subject, that acts, but only,** to repeat an earlier phrase, **a reiterated acting that is power in its persistence** and instability. **This is less an "act," singular** and deliberate, **than** a nexus of **power** and discourse **that repeats** or mimes the discursive gestures of power. Hence, the judge who authorizes and installs the situation he names invariably cites the law that he applies, and it is the power of this citation that gives the performative its binding or conferring power.

**Just last month three students at the University of Puget Sound, where we are now were suspended until 2019 for standing up to racism, sexism, xenophobia, and lies about inclusivity and diversity on campus. Even still the debate community remains silent and complacent in the oppression that strikes so close to their community. These things don’t affect you like they affect me, but if you think I will be silent on the issue then you are mistaken. This is an additional reason you grant aff RVI’s in this unique situation.**

**[AND**]

#### Thus the role of the ballot is to endorse the debater who best disassembles anti-blackness through micro-political action. Currently, the debate space is ignoring the oppression of black debaters and holding us back from addressing anti-blackness as a community, and the community systemically excludes black debaters from “speech” vis-à-vis competition. Smith 13

[Elijah Smith, A Conversation in Ruins: Race and Black Participation in Lincoln Douglas Debate, Vbriefly, 9/4/13 <http://vbriefly.com/2013/09/06/20139a-conversation-in-ruins-race-and-black-participation-in-lincoln-douglas-debate/>]   
**At every tournament you attend this year look around** the cafeteria **and take note of which students are not sitting amongst you** and your peers. Despite being some of the best and the brightest in the nation, many students are alienated from and choose to not participate in an activity I like to think of as homeplace. **In addition to the heavy financial burden associated with national competition, the exclusionary atmosphere of a debate tournament discourages black students from participating.** Widespread awareness of the same lack of participation in policy debate has led to a growing movement towards alternative styles and methods of engaging the gatekeepers of the policy community, (Reid-Brinkley 08) while **little work has been done to address** or even acknowledge **the** same **concern in Lincoln Douglas debate. Unfortunately students of color are not only forced to cope with a reality of structural violence outside of debate, but within an activity they may have joined to escape it in the first place. We are facing** more than a simple trend towards marginalization occurring in Lincoln Douglas, **but a culture of exclusion that locks minority participants out of the ranks of competition.** It will be uncomfortable, it will be hard, and it will require continued effort but the necessary step in fixing this problem, like all problems, is the community as a whole admitting that such a problem with many “socially acceptable” choices exists in the first place. **Like all systems of social control, the reality of racism in debate is constituted by the singular choices that institutions, coaches, and students make on a weekly basis.** I have watched countless rounds where competitors attempt to win by rushing to abstractions to distance the conversation from the material reality that black debaters are forced to deal with every day.One of the students I coached, who has since graduated after leaving debate, had an adult judge write out a ballot that concluded by “hypothetically” defending my student being lynched at the tournament. Another debate concluded with a young man defending that we can kill animals humanely, “just like we did that guy Troy Davis”. Community norms would have competitors do intellectual gymnastics or make up rules to accuse black debaters of breaking to escape hard conversations but as someone who understands that experience, **the only constructive strategy is to acknowledge the reality of the oppressed**, engage the discussion from the perspective of authors who are black and brown, and then find strategies to deal with the issues at hand. **It hurts to see competitive seasons come and go and have high school students and judges spew the same hateful things you expect to hear at a Klan rally. A student should not, when presenting an advocacy that aligns them with the oppressed, have to justify why oppression is bad. Debate is not just a game, but a learning environment** with liberatory potential. Even if the form debate gives to a conversation is not the same you would use to discuss race in general conversation with Bayard Rustin or Fannie Lou Hamer, that is not a reason we have to strip that conversation of its connection to a reality that black students cannot escape. **Current coaches and competitors alike dismiss concerns of racism and exclusion**, won’t teach other students anything about identity in debate other than how to shut down competitors who engage in alternative styles and discourses, and refuse to engage in those discussions even outside of a tournament setting.

#### Black debaters are treated as second class debaters from the moment they join the activity We lose speaker points for not having “professional” hair styles… We are told that we are very articulate as if Black teenagers aren’t supposed to be… We are forced to compete on campuses and stay in hotels that have a brutal history of racism.

#### When we come to tournaments on campuses that can often be the ones perpetuating racism and we are silent we send a message that academia is steadfast in its resistance to be in solidarity with the oppressed.

#### And, the methodology and utilization of the 1AC is key to challenge hegemonic knowledge production – marginalized voices are excluded in the academia in the status quo. **Stanley 7** [Dr. Christine A. Stanley '90 is the Vice President and Associate Provost for Diversity and Professor of Higher Education Administration in the College of Education and Human Development at Texas A&M University, 2007, “When Counter Narratives Meet Master Narratives in the Journal Editorial-Review Process”, http://edr.sagepub.com/content/36/1/14.full.pdf+html]//dickies

I am a Black woman professor and have served in a variety of senior administrative positions in higher education for the past 14 years. My administrative experiences include serving as president of a national organization, as associate director of a teaching center, as associate dean of faculties, and now as executive associate dean for faculty affairs. All these experiences have been at research-extensive universities. I have been engaged in research on the experiences of faculty members of color teaching at predominantly White research-extensive universities for the past 6 years. Specifically, I have been exploring the production and dissemination of new knowledge and the ways these relate to the diversity of the professoriate in higher education. African Americans, American Indians, Asian Americans, and Latinas/Latinos, in particular, constitute between 20% and 25% of the U.S. population. However, they represent 13.4% of the faculty at degree-granting institutions of higher education (National Center for Education Statistics, 2000). There are many reasons for this disparity. Some scholars argue that it is due to issues related to campus life and climate (Aguirre, 2000; Bower, 2002; Johnsrud & Sadao, 1998; Turner, 2003), discrimination (Freeman, 1978; Thomas & Hollenshead, 2001; Turner & Meyers, 1999), and tenure and promotion (Antonio, 2002; Blackburn, Wenzel, & Bieber, 1994; Fenelon, 2003; Ruffins, 1997). However, another reason that has not yet been explored is the interplay between master narratives` in the peer-review process for publication and the ways this could affect the diversity of the professoriate. The term master narrative, or grand narrative, was first introduced by French philosopher Jean-Francois Lyotard (1984). Such narratives are hallmarks of “the enlightenment and Western philosophical tradition” (Giroux, 1993, p. 463) that act to universalize and cast dialogues in binary, contrasting categories that support the maintenance of dominant groups. A master narrative is a script that specifies and controls how some social processes are carried out. Furthermore, there is a master narrative operating in academia that often defines and limits what is valued as scholarship and who is entitled to create scholarship. This is problematic, because the dominant group in academia writes most research and, more often than not, they are White men. Members of marginalized groups, such as women and people of color, have had little or no input into the shaping of this master narrative. Therefore, research on marginalized groups by members of marginalized groups that reveals experiences that counter master narratives is often compared against the White norm (Fine, Weis, Powell, & Wong, 1997). Perspectives that run opposite or counter to the presumed order and control are counter narratives. These narratives, which do not agree with and are critical of the master narrative, often arise out of individual or group experiences that do not fit the master narratives. Counter narratives act to deconstruct the master narratives, and they offer alternatives to the dominant discourse in educational research. They provide, for example, multiple and conflicting models of understanding social and cultural identities. They also challenge the dominant White and often predominantly male culture that is held to be normative and authoritative. Such counter narratives in higher education by women faculty members and faculty members of color might suggest that differences exist for them in their academic experiences that are distinct from those of majority White faculty members (Erler & Kowaleski, 2003). For example, these targeted groups often give voice to counter experiences related to individual, institutional, and societal oppression that shape their behaviors in a given situation (Fine, Ayala, & Perkins, 2000; Romero & Stewart, 1999). These alternative lenses of analyses and interpretations of experiences frequently question and criticize master narratives.

#### I advocate that public colleges and universities ought not restrict the right to free speech of Black individual The approach that the 1AC takes is uniquely key we actually take a stance against this form of anti-blackness in a way that is tangible, but we do so in a way that doesn’t cede the political to the alt right which would only re-entrench the aforementioned oppression. We also don’t use the state or any other oppressive institution as an actor rather we endorse individual action that makes systemic change. Challenging hegemonic narratives within existing institutions key – giving up on academia only re-entrenches authority

Giroux 13 [Henry Giroux, a former professor at Penn State and currently the Global Television Network Chair of English and Cultural Studies at McMaster University in Ontario, Canada, SEPTEMBER 27, 2013, “Henry Giroux on the Militarization of Public Pedagogy”, http://www.counterpunch.org/2013/09/27/teaching-and-learning-with-henry-giroux/]//dickies

SK: Here’s a paradox for you: How do you teach social change or resistance to authority within public schools – institutions that many have criticized for being authoritarian and resistant to change? HG: You can’t do it if you believe these institutions are so authoritarian that there’s simply no room for resistance. That’s a mistake. **Power is never so overwhelming that there’s no room for resistance.** Power and the forms it takes are always contradictory in different ways and there is always some room for resistance. **What needs to be understood is the intensity** of dominant power **in different contexts and how it can be named, understood, and fought**. The issue here is to seize upon the contradictions at work in these institutions and to develop them in ways that make a difference. During the sixties, the term for this was the long march through institutions and the reference had little to do with reform but with massive restructuring of the instruments of democracy. And we also need to impose a certain kind of responsibility upon adults in the schools – whether they be social workers, university professors, or high school teachers. Clearly it’s not enough to say they operate under terrible burdens that make them voiceless. I understand those structural conditions but it doesn’t mean they shouldn’t resist either. That means they not only have to promote particular kinds of pedagogies in their classrooms but they also have to join social movements that give them the force of a collective voice that can bear down on these problems and create change. The greatest battle that we’re facing in the U.S. today is around the question of consciousness. If people don’t have an understanding of the nature of the problems they face they’re going to succumb to the right-wing educational populist machine. This is a challenge that the Left has never taken seriously because it really doesn’t understand that at the center of politics is the question of pedagogy. Pedagogy is not marginal, it is not something that can be reduced to a method, limited to what happens in high schools, or to what college professors say in their classes. Pedagogy is fundamental not only to the struggle over culture but also, if not more importantly, the struggle over meaning and identity. It’s a struggle for consciousness, a struggle over the gist of agency, if not the future itself – a struggle to convince people that society is more than what it is, that the future doesn’t simply have to mimic the present. SK: What would this look like in practice? One encouraging experiment I had the privilege of observing up close is taking place at the Emiliano Zapata Street Academy in Oakland. There, in an “alternative high school” within the Oakland Unified School District, student interns working with a group called BAY-Peace lead youth in interactive workshops on topics relevant to their lives: street violence, the school-to-prison pipeline, military recruiters in their schools, and so on. HG: I think two things have to go on here, and you just mentioned one of them. We’ve got to talk about alternative institutions. **There has to be some way to build institutions that provide a different model of education.** On the Left, we had this in the ‘20s and ‘30s: socialists had Sunday schools, they had camps; they found alternative ways to educate a generation of young people to give them a different understanding of history, of struggle. We need to reclaim that legacy, update it for the twenty-first century, and join the fight over the creation of new modes of thinking, acting, and engaging ourselves and our relations to others. On the second level is what Rudi Dutschke called what I referred to earlier as the “long march through the institutions.” It’s a model that makes a tactical claim to having one foot in and one foot out. **You can’t turn these established institutions over to the Right.** You can’t simply **dismiss them by saying they’re nothing more than hegemonic institutions that oppress people. That’s a retreat from politics. You have to fight within these institutions.** Not only that, you have to **create new public spheres.** SK: Henry, we’ve covered a lot of territory. Is there anything we haven’t addressed that you would like to bring up before closing? HG: **We need both a language of critique and** a language of **hope. Critique is essential** to what we do **but it can never become so overwhelming that all we become are critics** and nothing else. It is counterproductive for the left to engage in declarations of powerlessness, without creating as Jacques Rancière argues “new objects, forms, and spaces that thwart official expectations.” What **we need to** do is theorize, understand and **fight for a society that is very different from the one in which we now live**. That means taking seriously the question of pedagogy as central to any notion of viable progressive politics; it means working collectively with others to build social movements that address a broader language of our society – questions of inequality and power (basically the two most important issues we can talk about now.) And I think that we need to find ways to support young people because the most damage that’s going to be done is going to be heaped upon the next generations. So what we’re really fighting for is not just democracy; we’re fighting for the future. And so critique is not enough; we need a language of critique and we need a language of possibility to be able to go forward with this.

# Part 2: Underview

1. **The debate space is key to stopping oppression- it begins with ending intellectual alienation**
2. **The k comes before any concept of fairness as fairness is subjective and increases judge intervention.**
3. **Reasonability outweighs Competing Interps**